



City of Carmel

CARMEL PLAN COMMISSION

August 15, 2006

Minutes

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Carmel Plan Commission met at 6:00 PM in the Council Chambers of City Hall, Carmel, Indiana. Members present: Jerry Chomanczuk, Leo Dierckman, Dan Dutcher, Wayne Haney, Kevin Heber, Carol Schleif, Madeleine Torres, Susan Westermeier, thereby establishing a quorum. The meeting opened with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Department of Community Services Staff present: Director Mike Hollibaugh, Planning Staff Matt Griffin and Christine Barton-Holmes. John Molitor, legal counsel was also present.

The minutes of the July 18, 2006 meeting were approved as submitted.

Legal Counsel Report: John Molitor reported that the Executive Committee had recommended certain amendments to the Rules of Procedure. The amendments will be discussed following Old Business.

Department Announcements: Matt Griffin announced that the following items have been Continued to September 19, 2006: Item 1H, Guerrero Property PUD; Item 3H, Bill Estes Pre-Owned Facility; and Item 1I, Midtown Village PUD.

1G. Gramercy Economic Development Plan – Resolution

by Michael R. Shaver, Wabash Scientific

David Leazenby, Buckingham Properties appeared before the Commission. At this time, Mr. Leazenby offered no additional comments on the previously approved PUD Ordinance for Gramercy.

John Molitor clarified the Plan Commission's role in "signing off" on this particular resolution. The Plan Commission's role is to review this type of plan in order to determine whether or not the plan proposed by the Redevelopment Commission conforms to the Comprehensive Plan for the community. Whether or not the area is developed as a TIF district is not a part of the review by the Plan Commission.

Leo Dierckman made formal motion to approve the Gramercy Economic Development Plan-Resolution, seconded by Madeleine Torres, APPROVED 8-0.

H. Public Hearings:

1H. Docket No. 06010003 Z: Guerrero Property PUD – CONTINUED TO SEPT 19

The applicant seeks to rezone 38.8 acres from S1/Residential to PUD/Planned Unit Development for the purpose of developing attached single-family residences and townhomes.

The site is located at the northwest corner of Towne Road and 131st Street.

Filed by Charles Frankenberger of Nelson and Frankenberger for Indiana Land Development Co.

2H. Docket No. 06060016 Z: Cherry Tree Grove Rezone

The applicant seeks to rezone 20.44 acres from S1 to S2 to allow for low-density residential development. Commitments will be filed in conjunction with this request.

The site is located on the east side of Cherry Tree Road, south of 146th Street.

Filed by Matthew Skelton of Baker & Daniels, LLP.

Matt Skelton, attorney with Baker & Daniels, 600 East 96th Street, appeared before the Commission representing the applicant. Chris White, RDJ Land Development was also in attendance.

The applicant is requesting a zoning change to S-2 to allow a 34-lot, low-density residential development located on the east side of Cherry Tree Road, south of 146th Street. The anticipated prices of the homes range from \$400 to \$700,000. A set of commitments has been tendered from the petitioner that essentially links the proposal to the plan and limits the number of lots to 34 as shown. The commitments also adopt the City's draft of architectural standards.

The petitioner held a neighborhood open house and had a significant response from the neighbors. The comments received at the open house were generally supportive and positive. The petitioner would like to begin earth-work on the site this year in order to eliminate the hassle for the adjacent property owners and surrounding area for next year. Therefore, a Primary Plat level of detail has been provided; the petitioner is hoping that there might be an opportunity to expedite the process. The applicant would like to start construction of the homes in early 2007.

Members of the public were invited to speak in favor of the petition; the following appeared:

Favorable/General

Jeff Brisley, 14558 Cherry Tree Road, representing self and wife Dottie, live on the property abutting the entire north face of the proposed development. The Brisleys expressed support for CRWhite Development and RDJ Custom Homes in their request to rezone the 20.44 acres. The plans regarding Cherry Tree Grove involve keeping the property in as close to the natural setting of Cherry Tree Road as possible in that the trees will be maintained and preserved in place—a significant concern for surrounding property owners. The Brisleys asked that the Commission consider expediting the process. There are a number of children in the area and to move in heavy equipment and do the earth work now before Spring and Summer would be advantageous for those persons in residence.

Barry Smalstig, 14320 Cherry Tree Road, representing self and wife, stated that the proposed development will form the north and east boundary of their property. The Smalstigs are generally supportive of the proposal, but have the following concerns: What is the density maximum and why is the change from S-1 to S-2 zoning necessary? Cherry Tree Road is a narrow, twisty, rural road that now has about 20 single-family homes on large wooded lots. Cherry Tree Road has already been negatively affected by the increased traffic from Pulte Cherry Creek Development (300 plus homes) that currently open onto Cherry Tree Road in two different locations. Cherry Tree Grove would probably add 50 to 60 vehicles of daily traffic onto this rural, small road. The residents feel that they might be able to live with the increased traffic, but the portion of the plan they strenuously object to is the access road to the adjacent, proposed, 400-acre Legacy Development. The residents understand the City's desire for connectivity of neighborhoods, but opening access to The Legacy Development would put an unreasonable amount of traffic onto Cherry Tree Road. If a connection is insisted upon, a biking or walking path would be preferable and in keeping with the current designation of Cherry Tree Road as a biking route. Currently, there is an existing, alternate access to the proposed subdivision that can be used for emergency vehicles. With the limitations specified, the residents feel that the Cherry Tree Grove proposal could work.

Unfavorable: None

Rebuttal: Matt Skelton commented that the proposal would be comparable lots to those surrounding and also to The Legacy lots to the east. The petitioner's clear preference would be not to stub to the adjoining subdivision to the east; however, it is a requirement of the City and the petitioner will defer to the Department. The change to S-2 zoning actually allows the plan to happen—comparable lot sizes, and the set aside of the heavily wooded area along Cherry Tree Road in order to preserve the untouched appearance. The petitioner does understand that he will likely be required to install a pedestrian pathway along the road. To the extent that the petitioner is not required to make changes, the petitioner would prefer to leave Cherry Tree Road as it is today.

Department Comments, Matt Griffin: The Department has no additional comments at this time and recommends that this item be referred to the Subdivision Committee on September 5, 2006.

Commission Members Comments/Questions:

Wayne Haney noted that the residents along Cherry Tree Road have been subjected to a great deal of inconvenience, noise, dirt, construction traffic and equipment. Cherry Tree Road has been used excessively by construction contractors and this should be monitored more closely—there are a lot of existing homes in the area.

Dan Dutcher asked for further definition of Lot 34 and what is intended for this area. Exactly what is the definition of a conservancy lot? This should be reflected in the commitments.

Matt Skelton responded that the petitioner is following the standards set forth in the Ordinance for Conservancy Lots that allow up to 25% of this parcel to be used as a single home site and the balance would remain untouched and qualify as part of the open space. No part of the conservancy lot is wetlands and the single home site is not yet planned but will be a custom home site.

Carol Schleif asked that the lot dimensions be made larger and easier to read. Are there trees that are being cut down? It would be good if the petitioner were to submit an aerial photo with the proposed site plan overlaid on it—not opaque—so that it can be viewed easier. Carol agreed that the lakes should look like natural lakes and not square in shape.

Matt Skelton reported that every tree that can be saved would be saved. However, there are some trees scattered that may be in the road area. Matt Skelton said he would provide more detailed information for the Committee.

Dan Dutcher commented that at some point, the Commission would look to the Department to respond as to how the design standards articulated here compare to the Department's.

Matt Griffin said the Department had withheld comments until the primary plat phase but would include those comments for Committee discussion. The S-2 zoning has a maximum density of 2.4 units and what is being proposed is 1.6—less than was permitted in this section under S-1. If the rezone were approved, it would behoove the Commission to request commitments to limit the density to something more appropriate as opposed to the 2.4 density.

Matt Skelton responded that the commitments before the Commission include that density restriction. The petitioner is limiting the development to 34 homesites—approximately 1.6 density.

It was determined that there were open items to be addressed and the Commission chose not to waive its Rules of Procedure.

Docket No. 06060016 Z, Cherry Tree Grove Rezone was referred to the **Subdivision Committee** for further review on **Tuesday, September 5, 2006** in the Caucus Rooms of City Hall.

3H. Docket No. 06060023 DP/ADLS: Bill Estes Pre-Owned Facility – CONT. TO. SEPT 19

The applicant seeks to construct a new, 9,350-square foot, pre-owned vehicle sales facility. Variances for signage, landscaping, and bufferyards will be filed. The site is located at 4102 West 96th Street and 9884 Michigan Road, and is zoned B2. Filed by Mary Solada of Bingham McHale LLP for Bill Estes Chevrolet.

4H. Docket No. 06060018 DP Amend: Village Center/Peripheral Retail-VOWC

The applicant seeks to modify the existing site plan and Development Requirements for the Village of West Clay—Village Center and Peripheral Retail Area. The site is located at Towne Road and 131st Street, and is zoned PUD. Filed by Keith Lash of Brenwick TND Communities, LLC.

George Sweet, Brenwick Development appeared before the Commission representing the applicant. Also in attendance: Keith Lash.

Brenwick is requesting three modifications to the existing site plans. One modification is for the creation of a new lot category for the Village Center. The second modification would be for revising the district exhibit—in essence, swapping a portion of the retail area for senior housing. The third modification is for

the peripheral retail area of signage.

There are three basic areas that are not fully developed at this point; currently there are about 10 buildings in existence in the mixed use. The petitioner is getting a lot of innovative architecture and design concepts that they would like to have addressed.

The current request for modifications does not compromise the single and multi-family housing in the Village Center and does not increase or change the density. The minimum lot area would remain unchanged; however, the minimum lot width would change from 32 to 30 feet; the minimum lot depth would be by reducing it 10 feet; and the minimum build-to line would be reduced to 5 feet. The aggregate side yard would be 12% of the width, (currently 20%) the minimum side yard would be no change, the rear is zero in the sense that most of the rear yards have alleys. In the Village Center with the common parking, there would not be any alleys. The maximum height in the Village Center would be increased to 50 feet and would match the height of some of the commercial buildings and the Meeting House. Finally, the maximum coverage would go to 80% as opposed to currently 60%.

The Senior Housing is currently under construction—the residential and commercial areas would be switched. The signage in the peripheral/retail area was originally at 12 inches. The petitioner is requesting no limit on the height of letters so that signage would fit with the architecture of the building.

Members of the public were invited to speak in favor of the petition; no one appeared.

Members of the public were invited to speak in opposition to the petition; the following appeared:

Marilyn Anderson, 3884 Shelborne Court noted that the Village of WestClay is special, and has repeatedly asked to have its own rules or to change the rules over the zoning. It is an exception to say that Brenwick should be allowed to do anything it wants. Brenwick is making some requests that have previously been refused. Marilyn referred to a plan proposed by Brenwick in October 2004 that left Commission and went on to the City Council with the last amendments. The commercial area was on both sides of the entrance road and the senior housing removed from that area. The City Council did not approve that plan and restricted the commercial area west of Towne Road in order to minimize the impact of commercial. Now, the Village of WestClay is asking to trade back. At that time, Councilors made statements in order to send a clear message of the intent to keep commercial off of Towne Road and that it was important to contain the commercial usage within the Village of WestClay so that it would match the original concept used to gain approval. The current proposal seems to be a way to circumvent what City Council specified.

Another refusal was the signage—reduced at the City Council level. Also at Council there were discussions that the commercial area would be different from the typical commercial development to grab the attention of people driving by to entice them to come in and buy; the reasoning was that the goal was not to advertise to drivers, but to identify the stores to people already in the shopping area. Therefore, there was not a need for large signs and larger signs were seen as detracting from a more pleasant walking environment and would make the area more like a typical commercial area, not someplace special. Again, this seems an attempt to circumvent the message given by City Council.

Hearing that a residential building is going to be 50 feet high and only a few feet between them, the “towering effect” should be considered. Five stories could be 50 feet—most of the Michigan Road corridor is restricted to 35 feet or less, although there is a small part where Marsh is located that is zoned B-2 and is permitted up to 60 feet, but that is only a small part. The concern with this proposal is the massing of the buildings and this should be reviewed. In regard to the location of commercial and the signage, the message

S:/PlanCommission/Minutes/PlanCommission/2006/2006aug15

was given at City Council.

Brian Baker, 2495 Durbin Drive, president of Crossfields Homeowners Assoc., echoed concern with the towering effect of the buildings. Also, the commercial property was to have been community serving by moving the commercial property to Towne Road and making the signage even more area serving—this would increase the traffic along Towne Road that has already seen a substantial increase in traffic north on Towne Road to Westfield.

Dee Fox, 11389 Royal Court, referred to the height of the buildings and said that was a bone of contention at the last round of request for the height of the senior housing—that request was denied. Ms. Fox was opposed to any increase in the current height, 40 or 45 feet.

Mary Ellen Bormet, Board President of Laural Lakes Community, was opposed to any height increase and was concerned about the possibility of additional traffic with the increase of commercial areas to Towne Road that would serve more than the local area of the Village of WestClay.

Rebuttal, George Sweet: The area referred to by Marilyn Anderson was several iterations ago and was taken out of the request—the City Council had agreed to commercial in the general area and it is already built as such. The current request has nothing to do with height; it is a neighborhood center anticipated to serve the neighborhood. It is difficult from a signage standpoint—the neighborhood cannot be served well if there is no signage to identify the name and location of the establishment. The height is completely within the Village Center and is no higher than some of the buildings that are already there—it has nothing to do with the height. It is important to note that the height issue and the modification of the housing is strictly within the Village Center. The commercial aspect is one lot, and the aspect of the neighborhood center is very important. When the project was first approved in 1999, there were 1400 homes approved; currently there are over 10,000 homes approved but not necessarily built.

Regarding traffic, the Village is currently constructing the Towne Road extension with its own funds; there will be a round about at 131st, built by the City. The Village is also building two additional round abouts, all of which have been approved by the City and reviewed by their design engineer.

Department Comments, Matt Griffin: Nothing additional at this time. The Department is comfortable with this item as proposed and would support suspension of the Rules of Procedure. Otherwise, if the Commission would like further discussion as far as history, previous requests, and the current request, the Department would agree with sending this item to Special Studies Committee in order to “even out” the workload.

Jerry Chomanczuk announced that the public hearing is now closed and any further public input would be at the discretion of the Committee chairperson.

Commission Comments:

Dan Dutcher asked how much additional commercial frontage would be added to Towne Road.

George Sweet responded that it would be 150 to 200 feet.

Matt Griffin explained that as initially approved by City Council, any minor alterations to the Development Plan would be at the discretion of the Plan Commission and treated as an amendment.

Jerry Chomanczuk said it would be helpful to have what is proposed and the previously approved Ordinance before the Committee for the sake of comparison.

Susan Westermeier suggested that Council be made aware and give their blessing to the increased area of commercial on Towne Road.

Carol Schleif requested a blue-line/red-line copy of Ordinance Z-330 and the February 7th amendment so that the changes are readily seen. Carol also asked if the building height could be limited to three stories.

George Sweet said he would produce mock-up copies of the Ordinance from 1999 to the modifications made, to the present proposal. Mr. Sweet said that from an innovative standpoint, he would not want to limit to three floors—he would be OK with four floors—that is what the senior housing was approved at—four floors.

Docket No. 06060018 DP Amend, Village Center/Peripheral Retail-VOWC was referred to the Special Studies Committee for further review on September 5, 2006.

Note: Item 5H was heard in conjunction with item 2I under Old Business and considered separately.

5H Docket No. 06070007 DP/ADLS: 122nd & Penn Development.

The applicant seeks to construct two, 3-story office buildings, out of three proposed buildings total, on a 27.41-acre office park.

The site is located at the northeast corner of 122nd Street and Pennsylvania Street, and is currently zoned R1 and M3, with a B3 rezone request pending.

Filed by Paul Reis of Bose McKinney & Evans, LLP for Panattoni Development, LLC.

Paul Reis, attorney with Bose McKinney & Evans appeared before the Commission representing the applicant. Also in attendance: John Jaffe, project manager with Panattoni Development; Fred Simmons, Simmons & Assoc, architects; Andy Gertham and Brian Muhl, American Consulting Engineers; Steve Granner, Land Planner with Bose McKinney & Evans.

An aerial view of the site was displayed. The petitioner is proposing to construct an office park on the 27 acres of undeveloped land located at the northeast corner of 122nd and Pennsylvania Streets.

Mr. Reis highlighted some of the uses and the zoning in the area. The area will be improved when the round-about is completed at Old Meridian.

Three buildings are proposed; two have been submitted for architectural design, one building is

shown as a footprint only to show calculation of parking, etc. for a building this size. The footprint of the building may change and if this were the case, the petitioner would return for a Development Plan Amendment. There is ingress/egress off 122nd Street, a main entry off Pennsylvania Street into the site, and the retention area.

The petitioner is wanting to create something other than a “sea of asphalt;” whether the trees end up in the exact positions is uncertain, but the intent is consistent with what the Department Report is suggesting and its recommendations. This is a fairly large tract of land and it does need to be carefully planned. The buildings have been designed to work and are consistent with the various uses in the area.

Scott Brewer, Urban Forester has submitted his comments regarding the landscape plan, and the plan has been based upon the site plan. There was some concern with the buffering along 122nd Street and along Pennsylvania Street. Those issues can be addressed, but as the site plan is changed, the landscape plan will be amended. At this time, the petitioner is working through the Staff comments and will be submitting revisions to Scott Brewer prior to the September 05 Special Studies Committee.

Paul Reis noted that the petitioner has worked hard to come up with buildings that are consistent and complementary to all the buildings in this area. Building design will be gone over further at the Committee level. As the site design is established, the photo-metric lighting plan will be submitted.

Members of the public were invited to speak in favor of or opposition to this petition; no one appeared and the public hearing was closed.

Department Report, Matt Griffin: The Department is recommending this item be referred to the Special Studies Committee for further review and discussion on September 5th.

Commission Comments/Questions:

Jerry Chomanczuk noted that there are at least one dozen comments and questions on the Department Report. Where are we on getting those comments addressed?

Matt Griffin responded that the Department has not received revised plans. Scott Brewer finished reviewing the project late yesterday and official comments were just received regarding the current proposed landscape plan. Otherwise, no proposed amendments or changes have been received to address the Department Report.

Jerry Chomanczuk commented that the parking areas associated with the buildings do not really specify the number of spaces. There should be a 3 to 1 ratio—at least 680 parking spaces for the two buildings. Also, will any of the third building be retail?

Matt Griffin responded that there is actually one extra space. The petitioner is providing one space for every 250 square feet of office space.

Paul Reis said it is too early to know whether or not there will be retail in the third building.

Wayne Haney commented that this is a very important site and more creative use could be made of the retention pond. The entrances are non-descript and the buildings should be softened a little and made more inviting.

Sue Wetermeier agreed with Wayne Haney's comments and said there is really nothing "Wow!" about the buildings—they are sort of boring.

Paul Reis responded that these are nice buildings, but would not win an architectural award. There are no architectural standards for this area—there are for the old US 31 Overlay zone and Old Meridian, but no standards in this area.

Carol Schleif noted that there are "un-boring" buildings in this area and a lot of it has to do with differing massing of the buildings—three stories, two stories, varying the building height, there is articulation around the windows, there are patterns and variations of the amount of attention to detail given on the façade. One building has an unusual skylight in it.

John Molitor commented that perhaps some of these concerns could have been addressed when the rezone was under consideration—perhaps it will come up at City-Council review of the rezone. If the rezone goes through, we are limited in the ADLS review.

Matt Griffin said that the DP/ADLS is the appropriate time to review the building and the architecture. On the other side of Pennsylvania, there is substantially high-end landscaping and building design requirements. To the north of the round-about is the Old Meridian district that specifically calls out building massing, building sizes, etc. Technically, while not in that District, the petitioner chose some massing for the site as a contextual reference. As a point of reference, it is close enough to be shown as context. Whether or not it is included in the Overlay Zone would be up to the City Council to rezone—or it could be part of a commitment to the rezone that the Overlay Standards would apply to this parcel.

Paul Reis clarified that the petitioner is building the buildings, and part of the ADLS review is not only this building, but other buildings in the area that are not as nice as the Conesco headquarters building. We take the whole content of the area; we would not be allowed to build a building that would have a detrimental effect on the adjacent property uses. The proposed buildings are appropriate for this particular site.

Jerry Chomanczuk said he was not unduly concerned, but would like to see LEEDS requirements introduced at the Committee level—there is a wide range of LEEDS innovations that could be incorporated into the project without being a significant cost factor. It could be as simple as adding a bicycle rack to the site.

Matt Griffin responded that some of those things had been discussed previously such as a circuit path around the site, introduction of bio-swales, even allowing shower facilities in some of the buildings, day-lighting—the Department has gone over a number of LEEDS innovations and possibilities.

Docket No. 060700076 DP/ADLS, 122nd & Penn Development was referred to the Special Studies Committee for further discussion on September 05, 2006 at 6:00 PM

6H. Docket No. 06070008 DP/ADLS: Pennwood Professional Office Park.

The applicant seeks to construct two, 2-story office buildings, on a 4.11-acre parcel. The site is located at 11505 North Pennsylvania Street and is zoned B5.
Filed by E. Davis Coots of Coots, Henke, and Wheeler.

TABLED TO SEPTEMBER 19, 2006

I. Old Business

1I. Docket No. 06010008 Z: Midtown Village PUD – CONT. TO SEPT. 19

The applicant seeks to rezone 18.82 acres from I1/Industrail to PUD for the purpose of creating mixed use development.

The site is located at 510 Third Avenue SW and is zoned I1/Industrial.

Filed by Lawrence Kemper of Nelson and Frankenberger for Centex Homes.

2I. Docket No. 06060004 Z: 122nd & Pennsylvania Rezone

The applicant seeks to rezone 27.41 acres from R1 and M3 to B3 to allow for medium-density commercial office development.

The site is located on the northeast corner of 122nd Street and Pennsylvania Street.

Filed by Paul Reis of Bose McKinney & Evans LLP for Panattoni Development.

Paul Reis, attorney with Bose McKinney & Evans appeared before the Commission representing the applicant. The site located at the northeast corner of 122nd Street and Pennsylvania Street has split zoning—M-3 consistent with portions of the Consecos campus, warehouse and light industrial, and a portion that is still zoned R-1 residential. The petitioner has filed for a rezone to B-3 district that provides flexibility to address the development of this site consistent with some of the unique areas.

This petition was reviewed by Special Studies Committee and received a 3-0 unanimous vote recommending approval.

Department Comments, Matt Griffin: The Department has no outstanding comments or concerns regarding the rezone and recommend forwarding to City Council with a positive recommendation.

Committee report, Leo Dierckman: What we are seeing is more a housekeeping issue and the rezone seems to be a logical sep. The Committee voted 3-0 to recommend approval.

Susan Westermeier made formal motion to **forward Docket No. 06060004 Z, 122nd and Pennsylvania Rezone to the City Council with a positive recommendation**, seconded by Carol Schleif, Approved 8-0.

J. New Business

None

Here followed open discussion regarding the proposed amendments to the Rules of Procedure.

The amendment was prompted by confusion earlier this year whereby members of the public seemed to be under the impression that the public hearing is permanently left open and the public could continue to appear and testify before the Commission even after the matter was returned from Committee.

This matter was discussed at Executive Committee; the Rule would be that the President must close the public hearing after Staff Comments/Department Report. There is no discretion to leave the hearing open for additional public testimony after the proposal is returned to Commission from the Committee. This does not preclude the petitioner or even Staff from recommending that the Rules of Procedure be suspended and that the matter not be forwarded to Committee but brought to an immediate vote.

Regarding consequences of a withdrawn proposal by the petitioner or defeated, either by the Plan Commission or City Council in the case of a rezone: This amendment was prompted by the Fortune Farms proposal that was referred to City Council. There was a desire by the petitioner to withdraw the proposal before it came to a vote. The City Council took the position he could not withdraw the petition and then defeated the proposal. Regarding the Plan Commission Rules of Procedure, this situation was discussed—if a petition is withdrawn before it is defeated, there is a lock-out period with respect to reconsidering the same proposal or subject matter that is the same real estate parcel. In the case where a proposal is withdrawn, the lockout period would be three months before the same parcel could be considered—it would be six months if the identical proposal were submitted to the Commission and then on to the City Council in the case of a rezone.

Essentially, the time period would be doubled in the case of proposals that are defeated by the Plan Commission. There would be a one-year lock-out period before the same plat could be submitted for reconsideration; there would be a six month lock-out period before another plat could be submitted regarding the same parcel of real estate.

Leo Dierckman made formal motion to approve the amendments to the Rules of Procedure as recommended by the Executive Committee, seconded by Dan Dutcher, Approved 8-0.

Susan Westermeier made formal motion to approve Amendment A and Amendment B to the Commission's Rules of Procedure, seconded by Madeleine Torres, Approved 8-0.

The meeting adjourned at 8:10 PM.

Jerry Chomanczuk, President

Ramona Hancock, Secretary